

Appl. No. 09/410,642
Amdt. Dated July 15, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 1, 22, and 33–36 have been amended to clarify that the information packets comprise packet routing information that identifies at least one module on the interconnect. Support for the amendment can be found, among other places, in the specification at page 7, lines 16–18, and page 9, lines 1–3. In addition, claim 20 has been cancelled and claim 21 has been amended to conform better with claim 1, from which they depend. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

Claims 1–19 and 21–36 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendment and the following remarks.

A. The Rejection of Claims under § 102(b)

Claims 1–6, 11–13, 15–18, 20–22 and 25–34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,486,826 to Wolff *et al.* This rejection is traversed on the ground that Wolff does not have both data and packet routing information that identifies at least one module associated with data on the interconnect.

Independent claims 1, 22, 33 and 34 have been amended to clarify that the information packets comprise both data and packet routing information that identifies at least one module associated with the data on the interconnect. In contrast, Wolff only describes a multi-phase process that has a definition and response phase to establish a connection between a bus master and slave unit, always followed by a data transfer phase for transferring data between the units. See Wolff, col. 14, line 44 to col. 15, line 17. There is no routing information associated with the data transferred between the master bus and slave unit in Wolff because a connection between the units was established by in the previous cycle (i.e., the definition and response phase). This is entirely consistent with the module operation in Wolff that is akin to a circuit switched network rather than a packet switched

Appl. No. 09/410,642
Amtd. Dated July 15, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2003

network where routing information is associated with the data in each information packet.

The Office appears to take the position that the address information in *Wolff* is identical to packet routing information because the address information travels through buses that are connected to more than one device. See Office Action, page 15, lines 1–6. Having a bus that is connected to multiple devices, however, does not disqualify it from circuit switched operation or require it to operate like a packet switched system that routes packets of information. In short, there is nothing that inherently describes or even suggests the address information in *Wolff* includes packet routing information that identifies at least one module on the interconnect.

Independent claims 1, 22, 33 and 34, as amended, include at least one limitation that is neither described nor suggested by *Wolff*. Claims 2–6, 11–13, 15–18, 21 and 25–32 which depend from claims 1 and 22, include all the limitations of the claims from which they depend. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1–6, 11–13, 15–18, 20–22 and 25–34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Wolff* is respectfully requested.

B. The Rejection of Claims under § 103(a)

Claims 7–10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Wolff* in view of U.S. Patent 6,055,596 to *Cepulis*. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 7–10 depend from amended claim 1 and are believed to distinguish over *Wolff* for at least the same reasons as claim 1. *Cepulis* does not supply the deficiencies in *Wolff* as the reference does not contemplate packet interconnects.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Wolff* with U.S. Patent No. 4,918,693 to *Ardini, Jr. et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 14 depends from amended claim 1 and is believed to distinguish over *Wolff* for at least the same reasons as claim 1. *Ardini* does not supply the deficiencies in *Wolff* as the reference does not contemplate packet interconnects.

Appl. No. 09/410,642
Amtd. Dated July 15, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2003

Claim 19 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Wolff* with U.S. Patent No. 5,652,754 to *Pizzica*. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 19 depends from amended claim 1 and is believed to distinguish over *Wolff* for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 35, as amended, includes both data and packet routing information where each module has a unique identification on the interconnect and wherein the routing information identifies at least one of the modules associated with the data. *Pizzica* does not supply the deficiencies in *Wolff* as the reference does not contemplate packet interconnects.

Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Wolff* with U.S. Patent No. 5,678,028 to *Bershteyn et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 23 and 24 depend from amended claim 22 and are believed to distinguish over *Wolff* for at least the same reasons as claim 22. *Bershteyn* does not supply the deficiencies in *Wolff* as the reference does not contemplate packet interconnects.

Finally, claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Wolff* with U.S. Patent No. 4,942,552 to *Merrill et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 36 includes packet information that includes both a routing field and an address field and this combination of fields is not present in *Wolff*. See claim 36, line 5. *Merrill* does not supply the deficiencies in *Wolff* as the reference does not contemplate packet interconnects either.

C. Conclusion

In view of all of the above, claims 1–19 and 21–36 are believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Appl. No. 09/410,542
Amndt. Dated July 15, 2003
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2003

No fees are believed to be required with this Response, and should any be required, please charge Deposit Account 50-1123. Should any extension of time be required, please consider this a petition therefore and charge the required fee to Deposit Account 50-1123.

July 15, 2003

Eugene J. Bernard
Eugene J. Bernard, Reg. 42,320
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: (303) 454-2457
Facsimile: (303) 899-7333